

Cost Savings and Efficiency Work Group: Report of Findings and Recommendations

Suggested changes from MIFC

After reviewing the final report of the Cost Savings and Efficiency Work Group, the members of the Mayor's Infrastructure Finance Committee have suggested that the following suggestions be reviewed and considered for change in the report.

- ❑ The first suggestion deals with tying together the Capital Improvements Program and the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, discussion centered on public involvement in the CIP process and integrating the funding process and the planning process. It was also suggested to consider changing the funding process of the CIP to go beyond one year.

Detailed discussion from the meeting notes of March 20th is as follows:

Another recommendation noted the importance of instituting policies and procedures for closely tying the programming of capital projects with the growth phasing program and related policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Korell asked if the group looked at ways to institute those policies. Mr. Morgan stated that a key change is that the CIP and Comprehensive Plan will be brought forth for review at the same time. Mr. Meginnis asked if there was any discussion about public involvement with the CIP before being brought forth to the Planning Commission. Mr. Carlson stated that the group did not specifically look at that, but it is worth looking in to. Mr. Meginnis stated that since this is such an integral part of planning, public involvement should possibly be sought. Mr. Abbott stated that the CIP has only included the first year for approval for funding, but he believes that the process should be changed. Mr. Carlson stated that we have a funding process and a planning process, and we need to make sure they are integrated.

Mr. Korell stated that he would suggest even stronger wording and wanted a way to institutionalize this so that there is a long term approach to both planning and financing. He stated that the Committee should review this issue further, and in the role of the Committee, he felt they could recommend a change to the report.

- ❑ Secondly, regarding force mains as temporary facilities, the Committee felt it was important to quantify the term 'temporary'.

Detailed discussion from the meeting notes of March 20th is as follows:

Regarding the recommendation on force mains as temporary facilities, the Comp Plan says that it should be a gravity fed system, but the group wanted concessions to use a force main on a temporary basis. Ms. Crump questioned the definition of temporary. Mr. Abbott stated that it goes back to the legitimacy of the CIP. Mr. Korell stated that it should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Zink questioned if there was a process to avoid a political influence and stated that there should be some criteria in place.